

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending in the application. Claims 1-24 stand rejected. Claims 1, 7, 13, and 19 are the only independent claims. Claims 3, 7, 9, 13, 15, 19, and 21 have been amended to overcome informalities and for form. No new matter has been added. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-14, 16-20, and 22-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Miyagi et al., (Miyagi) U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0047916. The rejection on this ground is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 includes “a storage server for storing a message of video and/or audio contents when said message is sent from said information terminal to said network in response to the data distributed from said distribution server while said information terminal is being connected to said network.” This limitation is not disclosed or suggested by Miyagi.

The Office Action cites Paragraphs [0035], [0025] and claims 7, 8, 10, and 11 in Miyagi in rejecting this limitation of claim 1. Miyagi in the portion cited in the Office Action discloses “[a] controller microcomputer 16 controls transfer of image data between the blocks. In the above description, compressed image data is recorded in the memory card 18. The system configuration may use removable built-in nonvolatile memory for storing compressed image data.” This cited of Miyagi merely describes how image data is transferred between components of a digital camera (see Figure 2 of Miyagi). This portion of Miyagi does not disclose the claimed storage server, much less disclose a storage server for storing an audio/video message that is sent from the information terminal upon receipt of the audio/video message received from a distribution server as recited in claim 1.

Cited Paragraph [0025] does not disclose a “storage server” or any storage device. Paragraph [0025] merely describes processing and compressing video data. The cited portions do not require sending a message containing audio/video data in response to receipt of audio/video data received from a distribution server as required by claim 1.

Claims 7, 8, 10, and 11 in Miyagi are also cited in rejecting claim 1. These claims do not read on claim 1. For example, claim 7 recites “an image storage server connected to said wired network, wherein said selected amount of image data is output from said image pickup apparatus to said image storage server.” Claim 7 merely recites an “**image storage server**” where selected amount of “**image data**” is output. (Emphasis added). Claim 7 of Miyagi fails to disclose a storage server for storing an audio/video message that is sent from the information terminal upon receipt of the audio/video message received from a distribution server. Similarly claims 8, 10, and 11 of Miyagi fail to disclose the limitations of claim 1. For at least these reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 on the basis of Miyagi is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1 and include all of the limitations found in claim 1. These claims include further limitations which, in combination with the limitations of claim 1, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the art of record and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons discussed above.

The Office Action cites Paragraph [0025], [0035] and claims 7, 8, 10, and 11 in Miyagi in rejecting claim 7. Independent claim 7 recites “a storage server for storing a message of video and/or audio contents when said message is sent from said second information terminal to said network in response to the data distributed from said distribution server while said second information terminal is being connected to said network.” This limitation is not disclosed or suggested by Miyagi as discussed above in regards with claim 1. For at least all the reasons discussed in connection with claim 1, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 7 on the basis of Miyagi is respectfully requested.

Claims 8-12 depend from claim 7 and include all of the limitations found in claim 7. These claims include further limitations which, in combination with the limitations of claim 7, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the art of record and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons discussed above.

Independent claim 13 include the steps of “sending a message of video and/or audio contents from said information terminal via an uplink through said network to a storage server in response to said data distributed from said distribution server” and “storing said message sent from said information terminal in said storage server.” The Office Action on page 13 again cites Paragraph [0025] and [0035] and claims 7, 8, 10, and 11 in Miyagi in rejecting claim 13. Applicant respectfully submits that these limitations are not disclosed in the cited portions of Miyagi.

Neither the cited paragraphs in the specifications nor the cited claims of Miyagi disclose a distribution server or an uplink, as recited in claim 13, much less an information terminal sending a video and/or audio message through an uplink in response to the message received from the distribution server.

The two paragraphs of the specification merely disclose image data transfer in a camera and processing and compressing video data. These cited portions do not require sending a message containing audio/video data in receipt of audio/video data received from a distribution server. Similarly, claims 7, 8, 10, and 11 of Miyagi fail to recite an information terminal with an uplink or a distribution server, much less a storage server for storing an audio/video message that is sent from the information terminal upon receipt of the audio/video message received from a distribution server. For at least these reasons claim 13 is allowable and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 14-19 depend from claim 13 and include all of the limitations found in claim 13. These claims include further limitations which, in combination with the limitations of claim 13, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the art of record and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons discussed above.

Independent claim 19 includes the steps of “sending a message of video and/or audio contents from said second information terminal via an uplink through said network to a storage server in response to said data distributed from said distribution server” and “storing said message sent from said second information terminal in said storage server.” The Office Action cites Paragraph [0025] and [0035] and claims 7, 8, 10, and 11 in Miyagi in rejecting claim 19. These

cited portions fail to disclose a distribution server or an uplink as discussed above in regards with claim 13. For at least all the reasons discussed in connection with claim 13, claim 19 is allowable.

Claims 20-24 depend from claim 19 and include all of the limitations found in claim 19. These claims include further limitations which, in combination with the limitations of claim 19, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the art of record and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons discussed above.

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believes the pending application is in condition for allowance. No fee is believed to be due for this Amendment. Should any fees be required, please charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-2215.

Dated: December 6, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By Joseph W. Ragusa
Joseph W. Ragusa
Registration No.: 38,586
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 277-6500
Attorney for Applicant